

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 11, 15-17, 28, 29, 32-34 and 49 are requested to be cancelled.

Claims 1, 18, 30 and 38 are currently being amended.

No new claims are being added.

This amendment changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-10, 12-14, 18-25, 27, 30, 31, 35-48 and 50-53 are now pending in this application.

**Examiner Interview Summary**

An examiner interview was conducted on March 20, 2009. Steve Becker, counsel of record, attended by telephone with Examiner Shanto Abedin. The participants discussed the items listed on the Interview Form PTOL-413A (attached hereto). The substance of the arguments presented during the interview is set forth herein. No demonstration was conducted, and no agreement was reached.

On pages 3-11 of the Office Action, claims 1-26 and 27-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,970,927) in view of Bade et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,778,837) and further in view of Hastings et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,370,629). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination including, among other limitations, “storing a table comprising a plurality of security settings indexed by location,” “wherein at least one of the plurality of security levels is a default security level selected based on a determination that the table does not have a location corresponding to the determined location or based at least on the location of the network user node being unknown.” (Support at least at paragraphs [0032], [0037], [0042], [0043] and FIG. 3B). The claim further recites “wherein the step of modifying the security protection for the network user node includes modifying a data encryption parameter to change whether wireless data transmitted by the network user node will be encrypted.” (Support at least at Claim 17 as filed). The claim further replaces “continuously” with “repeatedly.” (Support at least at paragraphs [0037] and [0039]).

First, Stewart, Bade, and Hastings are systems that deny access to a network or data based on location. See Stewart at 3:14-18, Bade at 2:32-36, and Hastings at 1:44-46. In Claim 1 of the present application, the method allows access to a network even in unencrypted format, because the data encryption parameter can be modified “to change whether wireless data transmitted by the network user node will be encrypted.” Stewart teaches away from such a system at 3:40-43.

Second, Claim 1 recites “a default security level based on a determination that the table does not have a location corresponding to the determined location or based on the location of the network user node being unknown.” This limitation provides further distinction over the references.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 18 recites: “a processor configured to select a data encryption parameter based on the location and the table of security modifications to change whether wireless data transmitted by the computer system to the user node will be encrypted.” As stated above, Stewart, Bade, and Hastings are systems that deny access to a network or data based on location. The system of

Claim 18 allows access to a network even in unencrypted format. Stewart teaches away from such as system at 3:40-43.

Claim 30 recites: “using a network user node to modify security protection for wireless data communication to an encryption level selected from the selectable encryption levels.” Claim 30 further recites “using the network user node to set security protection for wireless data communication to a default encryption level.” This claim is allowable for similar reasons as discussed above with reference to Claim 1.

Claim 38 recites: “wherein the security modifications comprise modifying a data encryption parameter to change whether wireless data transmitted by the network user node will be encrypted.” As discussed above, Stewart, Bade, and Hastings are systems that deny access to a network or data based on location.

Claims 2, 3, 8, 14, 19, 20-23, 27, 31, 35, 39, 40-43, 46-48 and 50-53 depend variously from independent claims 1, 18, 30 or 38, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of

papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date /March 27, 2009/ \_\_\_\_\_

By /Steven C. Becker/ \_\_\_\_\_

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 26371  
Telephone: (414) 297-5571  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Steven C. Becker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 42,308